

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 were presented for prosecution. Claims 1, 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Kishi et al., US 6,639,580 (hereafter “Kishi”). Claim 3 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kishi in view of Ackley et al., US 6,375,899. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kishi in view of Ukigaya, US 6,873,451.

With respect to the Office’s suggestion regarding the specification, Applicant thanks the Office for providing information about recommended section headings and line spacing. However, Applicant respectfully declines to add the headings or change the line spacing. Section headings and double spacing are not statutorily required for filing a non-provisional patent application under 35 U.S.C. § 111(a), but per 37 C.F.R. § 1.51(d) are only guidelines that are suggested for Applicant’s use. See *Miscellaneous Change in Patent Practice*, Response to comments 17 and 18 (Official Gazette, August 13, 1996) [Docket No.: 950620162-6014-02] RIN 0651-AA75 (“Section 1.77 is permissive rather than mandatory. ... [T]he Office will not require any application to comply with the format set forth in 1.77.”)

With regard to the claim rejections, Applicant traverses the rejections for numerous reasons. For example, with regard claim 1, Applicant recites, *inter alia*, “each pixel being provided with an obstructing element.” The Office Action alleges that this feature is taught by Kishi as item 5 in Figure 30. Applicant strenuously traverses this conclusion for the following reasons. Item 5 in Figure 30 of Kishi is a control electrode that is not an obstructing element, but rather is a transparent device that allows light to pass. This is explicitly clear from the teachings of Kishi, in which it is stated that: “a transparent electrode such indium tin oxide (ITO) is used for the material for the first control electrode.” (See, column 27, lines 7-9.) Accordingly, item 5 in Figure 30 of Kishi could not

possibly teach the feature recited in Applicant's claim 1. For this, as well as other reasons, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Kishi.

The remaining claims are believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as for their own additional features.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Hoffman
Reg. No. 40,019

Dated: 8/17/2006

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC
75 State Street
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile